

Hieroglyphic-Luwian ma-tú-sà 'Arbutus'

Author(s): John A. C. Greppin

Source: *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*, 94. Bd., 1./2. H. (1980), pp. 119-122

Published by: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (GmbH & Co. KG)

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40848621>

Accessed: 20-06-2020 00:15 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/40848621?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht (GmbH & Co. KG) is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung*

It is further considered that the association of this verb with Cun. Luw. *u(wa)lanti-*, "dead" establishes that the full phonetic writing is *wal(a)-* (with variant *war(a)-*), and that this in turn may well be explained by a derivation from the I-E root **g^wel-*, "suffer, die". The other attestations of the logogram are examined, citations 4, 5 and 7, and though they are of varying degrees of obscurity, it is suggested that none contradicts the proposed interpretation. Finally two purely phonetic writings of a verb *arha wala-* are examined, citation 8, which, although also in a doubtful context, may well be an occurrence of the same verb.

School of Oriental and African Studies
Dept. of the Near and Middle East
Malet Street
London, WC 1 E 7 HP

J. D. Hawkins

Hieroglyphic-Luwian *ma-tú-sà* 'Arbutus'

The Hieroglyphic-Luwian word *ma-tú-sà* (Meriggi *ma-tu-s³*), hitherto enigmatically only in Sultanhan 6 M 28 and Bor 9 (= XXXIII C 4), has newly appeared in a stele from Aksaray which was described recently in this journal. The new information, coupled with the earlier attestations, permits us to hazard a more accurate description of *ma-tú-sà*. Let us first review its occurrences.

Its first appearance is fragmentary (Bor. fr. 9), being recorded by Meriggi¹): ...-*ta[-l]i-sa*²) *^kma-tu-sà*. Its second occurrence appears in Meriggi³) (Sultanhan fr. 27-28): *^kà-wa ^k383-ti-wa-ta-li-na^k i-ia-ti-i /²⁸ ^kwa-tu-u ^k u-sa-nú-ha 252. 2 ma-tu-sà*, the second half of which may be translated as "he has put up for him 252. 2⁴)

¹) *Manuale di eteo geroglifico, Parte II: Testi -2^a e 3^a serie*, Edizione dell'Ateneo (= *Incunabula Graeca* vol. XV*), Rome 1975. 11. All of Meriggi's transliterations have been redone to correspond to the suggestions made by Hawkins in "The Negative in Hieroglyphic Luwian", *Anatolian Studies* 25, 1975, 119-156, esp. pp. 154-155.

²) As will be noted in the other two inscriptions, *ma-tú-sà* is elsewhere preceded by the adjective *tiwatalis*, and we may now assume for Bor 9 . . . [*ti-wa*]-*tà[-l]i-sa ^kma-tú-sà*.

³) *Ibid*, *Parte II: Testi -1^a serie* (= *Incunabula Graeca* vol. XIV), Rome 1967, 119.

ma-tu-sà-i. The third instance is known from the new stele described by Mustafa Kalaç ("Ein Stelenbruchstück mit luwischen Hieroglyphen in Aksaray bei Niğde" [KZ 92, 1978 (1979). 117–125]). This new section is considerably longer, and though there are distinct difficulties, *ma-tú-sà* here appears with a helpful ideogram (Meriggi 144, Laroche 160) which has been traditionally translated as VINUM, thus designating *ma-tú-sà* as a type of plant. Kalaç's text and translation is as follows (p. 118, Satz 6): *à-wa à-[pa]-ta /³-ⁿza ANNUS u-sá-ⁿza ^k OVIS ha-wi-i XXX ti-wà-ta-li-sa QVILE-za CRÚS + RÁ/I XX ti-wà-tà-li-sa FONS-ti-sa [sa]-ⁿta X ti-wà-tà-li-sá VINUM ma-tú-sà CRUS + RÁ/I*. "Und in jenem Jahre traten (standen) Schafe (in) 30 . . . Pferchen, 20 . . . Quellen (?), standen 10 . . . Weiden (Wiese(?))". To this is added the comment (p. 123) that "Das Wort *ma-tu-sa* wird erstmals hier in Aksaray von einem Weinstock oder einem Baum determiniert". It is this particular determinative that is so helpful, for it permits us to suggest a more exact glossing for *ma-tú-sà*. To do this I will bring to bear the vocabulary of Classical Armenian which has previously been used to identify⁵), or coördinate with, Anatolian vocabulary, both of Indo-European origin⁶), and from the Hurrian/Urartian group⁷). In this case, HL *ma-tú-sà* corresponds phonetically to

⁴) Sign 252.2 is of unknown value, though it has been suggested that it is a numeral (see Meriggi *Glossar*, p. 166 and p. 239 [252.2 = (?) 382a]).

⁵) In this capacity, see my "A Note on Hittite *tarla-*", *RHA* 33, 1975, 54–57. Here Hitt. MUŠEN¹*tarla-* was compared to Arm. *tareln* 'stork'.

⁶) For a bibliography pertaining to the 'Hittite' elements, see my "'Hittite' Loan Words in Armenian"; in *Lautgeschichte und Etymologie, Akten der VI. Fachtagung für Indo-germanische und Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft, Wien 24.–29. September 1978*, Wiesbaden 1980, 203–207. Igor Diakonoff, in his *Predystorija armjanskogo naroda* (Yerevan 1968) proposed, for a variety of good reasons, that the so-called 'Hittite' vocabulary in Armenian might rather be Hieroglyphic Luwian. I have developed this idea in an article "Luwian Elements in Classical Armenian" which appeared in *Drevnij vostok* 3, 1978, 115–126.

⁷) Urartian elements in Armenian were identified as long ago as 1902, in an address given by Levon Mesérianz (Moscow) at the XIII. Internationaler Orientalisten-Kongreß (Hamburg, September 1902); no résumé exists, but in the *Verhandlungen* of the congress (Brill, Leiden 1904, 128–129) there is printed the discussion (approving) by C. F. Lehmann, Andreas and Bartholomae. An up to date bibliography of the research that has followed (principally Soviet) appears in my "Hurrian/Urartian Elements in Classical Armenian" which will be printed in the *Proceedings* of the Primo Simposio Internazionale di Cultura Transcaucasica, Milano, Bergamo, Venezia, 12–15 June 1979 (forthcoming).

CArm. *maṭ'uz*, a plant well identified with any of the genus *Arbutus* (Turk. *kocayemişi*, literally 'having big fruit'⁸); the Ottoman term was [*hoṣa-yemişi*]⁹), a tree described in the *Haybusak*¹⁰). The well known Armenian word is continued in some of the dialects, and Adjarian (*HAB*) cites Zēit'un *maṭ'uz*, Svedia *māt'ēōs*¹¹) as well as Zēit'un *maṭ'zi*, Sved. *māt'sina*¹²).

The genus *Arbutus* is a member of the family *Ericaceae* which also includes the genus *Erica* 'heather'. However, the *Arbutus* branch of the family *Ericaceae* is represented by two small trees, the better known of which is the *Arbutus unedo*. This tree, quite beautiful, has laurel like leaves, and clusters of drooping bells. Its fruit has the appearance (though not the taste) of strawberries, and for this reason it is popularly called the Strawberry Tree. It grows to ten meters high, and is found in maquis, rocky places, and thickets from Spain through Turkey, north Africa and Lebanon. The fruit is most tasteless, and for this reason modern botanists derive the species name *unedo* from Latin 'eat one', as if that would be enough. The tree is also cultivated as an ornamental.

Other than the near perfect phonetic accord, there is also circumstantial evidence from the Hieroglyphic text that would lend support to this translation of HL *ma-tú-sà*. Firstly, the *Arbutus unedo*

⁸) In the Marmora and Aegean regions of Turkey this word is also used for the 'fig'.

⁹) H. Ačaṙean, *Hayeren armatakan bararan*², vol. 3. 223–224, Yerevan 1977 (= *HAB*). Also see Ačaṙyan "Haykakank' D", *Teghekgagir* 1946/1, 31–35, esp. p. 32–33.

¹⁰) *Haybusak, kam haykakan busabarut'iwn*, Venice, San Lazzaro 1895, p. 410, item 1930.

¹¹) This final *-s* (*māt'ēōs*), rather than the *z* that is shown elsewhere, is problematic. The dialect of Svedia, a 'Western' dialect of Armenian, is well known for its archaisms, particularly for the retention of the *z*- as a marker for the accusative (eg. *disnim zmar* "I see mother"). Further, it does not regularly exhibit a passage of final **-z* to *-s* (as in *māt'ēōs*). The dialect has been thoroughly surveyed by Tigran Andreasyan (*Svedia barbara*, *K'ist'inagi lezun*, Yerevan 1967) where it is shown that the final *-z* is carefully retained (*eraz* = Sved. *iruz* [339], *sēz* = Sved. *siz* [382], *viz* = Sved. *vēz* [384], *xoz* = Sved. *xüz* [365], *pluz* = Sved. *pliz* [381]). In the accusative of the personal pronouns the reflexes are obscure (*k'ez* = Sved. *zk'i*, *mez* = Sved. *zmi*, *jez* = Sved. *zi* [78]). Thus the appearance of Sved. *māt'ēōs*, with final *-s*, presents a variation difficult to interpret. However, it would be quite impossible to suggest that *s*³ (*-sà*) be read as *z* since *s*³ frequently forms a nominative singular ending where *s* is expected: *asharmis*³, *karpatahuis*³, *Tuwatis*³, etc.

¹²) The suffix *-eni* is commonly found with tree names: the *Haybusak* also lists *matuzeni*.

would be found in the same sort of area, not suitable for cultivation where sheep would be pastured. Secondly, though the Luwians have left us only a rather small collection of words pertaining to the natural sciences, none the less they would not have found the *Arbutus* an insignificant tree, but rather, because of its beauty, a tree quite worthy of its own special name¹³).

Program in Linguistics
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio, 44115 USA

John A. C. Greppin

Griechisch πέτρᾱ, πέτρος

Griech. πέτρᾱ „Fels, Klippe“ und πέτρος „Stein“ sind beide seit Homer bezeugt. Im Gegensatz zu geläufigem πέτρᾱ (in der Il. 16mal Sing., 2mal Plur.; in der Od. 26mal Sing., 16mal Plur.) ist πέτρος im homerischen Epos nur 4mal zu belegen (nur Il., immer Versende). Es bezeichnet den Stein als improvisierte Wurfwaffe, vgl. *Il* 411sq. / . . . βάλε πέτρῳ / μέσσην καὶ κεφαλὴν . . . / und *Il* 734 / σκαίῃ ἔγχος ἔχων· ἑτέρῳφι δὲ λάζετο πέτρον /, ebenso die Kampfszenen *H* 263–271 mit / . . . λίθον εἴλετο χειρὶ παχείῃ / (264), / . . . Αἴας πολὺν μείζονα λαῶν αἰείρας / (268), / εἴσω δ' ἄσπιδ' ἔαξε βαλὼν μυλοειδέϊ πέτρῳ / (270) und *Y* 285–288 mit / . . . ὁ δὲ χερμάδιον λάβε χειρὶ / (285) und / . . . Αἰνείας μὲν ἐπεσσύμενον βάλε πέτρῳ / (288). Auch später wird πέτρος vorwiegend poetisch verwendet. Gebräuchlicher im Wortfeld „Stein“ ist λίθος (Hom.+), ältest dokumentiertes Wort ist λαῶς m. (myk.+).

Ganz unbefangen betrachtet, bietet sich für πέτρος eine Analyse als (aktiv) gefaßtes Instrument mit Suffix *-tro-*, für πέτρᾱ dagegen eine Interpretation als Ortsbezeichnung mit gleichem Suffix¹⁾.

¹³) In a personal communication, Massimo Poetto has informed me that in an article of his in *Rivista di archeologia* 3 (1979 forthcoming), he has offered a gloss for *tivatalis* of ‘splendid’, and has further redefined the ideogram 144 (Meriggi VINUM) as ‘luxuriant vegetation’, a reclassification that would well correspond with the suggestion of *Arbutus* presented here.

¹⁾ Zu griech. *-tros* m. vgl. N. Van Brock, *Recherches sur le vocabulaire médical du grec ancien*, Paris 1961, 17–41. Zum Genusunterschied *-tros* m./